Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **000**, 000–000 (0000) Printed 13 February 2017 (MN LATEX style file v2.2)

A model of interacting dark fluids tested with supernovae data

D. Bégué[1,2], C. Stahl[3,4,5,6,7] & S-S. Xue[3,4]
[1] *The Oskar Klein Centre for Cosmoparticle Physics, AlbaNova, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*
[2] *Department of Physics, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, AlbaNova University Center, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*
[3] *ICRANet, Piazzale della Repubblica 10, 65122 Pescara, Italy*
[4] *Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza", Piazzale Aldo Moro 5, 00185 Rome, Italy*
[5] *Nordita, KTH Royal Institute of Technology and Stockholm University, Roslagstullsbacken 23 SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*
[6] *Université de Nice Sophia Antipolis, 28 Avenue de Valrose, 06103 Nice Cedex 2, France*
[7] *E-mail: clement.stahl@icranet.org*

arXiv:1702.03185v1 [astro-ph.CO] 10 Feb 2017

13 February 2017

ABSTRACT

We compare the supernovae data to the predictions of a cosmological model of interacting dark matter and dark energy. This theoretical model can be derived from the effective field theory of Einstein-Cartan gravity with two scaling exponents δ_G and δ_Λ, related to the interaction between dark matter and dark energy. We perform a χ^2 fit to the supernovae Ia data to compare and contrast it with the standard ΛCDM model. We then explore the range of parameter of the model which gives a better χ^2 than the standard cosmological model. All those results lead to tight constraints on the scaling exponents of the model. Our conclusion is that this class of models, provides a decent alternative to the ΛCDM model.

1 INTRODUCTION

The acceleration of the expansion of the Universe has come to a huge surprise to most of the scientific community more than 15 years ago (Riess et al. 1998; Perlmutter et al. 1999). In modern cosmology, many hypothesis have been proposed to drive the accelerated period of expansion. Among these models is the ubiquitous dark fluid christen dark energy having an equation of state (EoS) corresponding to vacuum energy. This proposal is part of the standard model of cosmology called ΛCDM which requires the universe to be made of an hypothetical dark energy fluid, in addition to the baryonic matter and dark matter. Since 1999, many independent cosmological observations, such as Cosmic Microwave Background observations (Ade et al. 2016), have pointed towards the existence of dark energy. However, if its existence relies on a well established observational basis, its nature is still an opaque mystery. Different proposals include, among others, dynamical dark energy (quintessence) (Tsujikawa 2013), dynamical backreaction (Buchert 2008), inhomogeneous cosmologies (Bolejko et al. 2011; Stahl 2016) and modified gravity (Joyce et al. 2015). More recently, mainly on phenomenological ground, it has been discovered that allowing an interaction between dark energy and dark matter offers an interesting and attractive alternative to the standard model of cosmology. Such a phenomenological interaction is possible as the nature of the dark matter fluid is also poorly constrained and that general relativity only requires the total energy momentum to be conserved, but not the partial ones.

Interacting dark energy models (Frieman and Gradwohl 1991; Gradwohl and Frieman 1992; Wetterich 1995; Amendola 2000, 2004; Lee et al. 2006; Pettorino and Baccigalupi 2008; Valiviita et al. 2008; He and Wang 2008; Gavela et al. 2009; Faraoni et al. 2014; Salvatelli et al. 2014; Xue 2015a; Ferreira et al. 2014; Koivisto et al. 2015) rely on the idea that dark energy and dark matter do not evolve separately but interact with each other non-gravitationally (see also the recent review (Wang et al. 2016) and references therein). Most of the studies on interacting dark fluids focus on the relation to the cosmological data introducing an *ad hoc* coupling between dark matter and dark energy (Salvatelli et al. 2014; Murgia et al. 2016). A classification of those models was given in Koyama et al. (2009). In this work, we adopt a theoretical model arising directly from the quantum field theory of Einstein-Cartan gravity (Xue 2015a,b) and perform the link to a set of observational data: the supernovae Ia (hereafter SNe Ia).

Interacting dark energy models are known to solve the coincidence problem: in the present universe the contributions of dark matter and dark energy to the cosmic budget are of the same order, while their respective evolutions are drastically

different throughout the cosmic history. Let $\rho_c^0 = 3H_0^2/(8\pi G_0)$ be the critical energy density and $\rho_{M,\Lambda}$ be the energy densities of the dark matter and dark energy fluids. Here H_0 is the Hubble constant and G_0 is the gravitational constant. In the following, quantities with a subscript or superscript 0 are measured in the present universe. We define $\Omega_{\rm M}$ and Ω_Λ as the ratio between energy densities of dark matter and dark energy and the critical energy density:

$$\Omega_{\rm M,\Lambda} \equiv \frac{\rho_{\rm M,\Lambda}}{\rho_c^0}. \tag{1}$$

Knowing that the parameters $\Omega_{\rm M}$ and Ω_Λ vary differently with redshift z, with $\Omega_{\rm M} \propto (1+z)^3$ and $\Omega_\Lambda \propto \Omega_\Lambda^0$, the fact that $\Omega_{\rm M}^0 \sim \Omega_\Lambda^0$ is fairly unnatural: we are observing our Universe in a very peculiar epoch. Observe that with these definitions, the Friedmann equation is nothing but a constraint equation between the two fluids, namely $\Omega_M^0 + \Omega_\Lambda^0 = 1$.

The model considered in this paper relies on the Einstein-Cartan gravitational theory and the universe would be in the scale invariant ultra-violet fixed point of the theory, which we refer as *Quantum Field Cosmology* (QFC) model. It has been shown in Xue (2015a,b) that it is possible from this very general theory to propose an expression for the luminosity distance, and hence compare it to observational data. This paper aims at realizing this possibility and investigating whether this model, as other interacting dark energy models, offers a viable alternative to the ΛCDM model. Our article shares the same spirit than Sola et al. (2016b): not only it provides a phenomenological interacting dark energy framework, but it also presents theoretical motivations arising from quantum field theory. This article is divided as follow: in section 2 and 3, we present the basic equations of the QFC model and calculate an expression for the luminosity distance. In section 4, we perform a χ^2 fit to the supernovae data. Motivated by the encouraging results, we investigate in section 5 more systematically the parameter space of our model by asking the following question: which range of the parameter space of the QFC model offers a better alternative than the ΛCDM model. Finally, we give conclusions and perspectives in section 6.

2 QUANTUM FIELD COSMOLOGY

As one of the fundamental theories for interactions in Nature, the classical Einstein theory of gravity, which plays an essential role in the standard model of modern cosmology (ΛCDM), should be realized in the scaling-invariant domain of a fixed point of its quantum field theory[1]. It was proposed (Xue 2015a,b) that the present (low-redshift $z < 1$) cosmology is realized in the scaling-invariant domain of an ultraviolet-stable fixed point ($\sim G_0$) of the quantum field theory of Einstein gravity[2], and is described by

$$H^2 = H_0^2\Big[\Omega_{\rm M}^0 a^{-3+\delta_G} + \Omega_\Lambda^0 a^{-\delta_\Lambda}\Big], \tag{2}$$

$$a\frac{dH^2}{da} + 2H^2 = H_0^2\Big[2\Omega_\Lambda^0 a^{-\delta_\Lambda} - (1+3\omega_{\rm M})\Omega_{\rm M}^0 a^{-3+\delta_G}\Big]. \tag{3}$$

Here, a is the scale factor, $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter, Ω_Λ^0 represents the repulsive entropy force attributed to the increase of space-time quantum modes with EoS $p_\Lambda = -\rho_\Lambda$ in space-time manifold expansion, while $\Omega_{\rm M}^0$ represents the attractive force of particles (matter) of EoS $p_{\rm M} = \omega_{\rm M}\rho_{\rm M}$ ($\omega_{\rm M}$ is a constant, see below). Here $p_{\Lambda,{\rm M}}$ are the pressures of the dark fluids. In deriving Equations (2) and (3), motivated by observations, it was assumed that the curvature is null $k = 0$, implying $\Omega_\Lambda^0 + \Omega_{\rm M}^0 = 1$. In addition, in the framework of QFC model, both the gravitation constant and $\Omega_\Lambda/\Omega_\Lambda^0$ can vary, following the scaling evolutions $G/G_0 \approx a^{\delta_G}$ and $\Omega_\Lambda/\Omega_\Lambda^0 \approx a^{-\delta_\Lambda}$, where $a = (1+z)^{-1} \gtrsim 1$. In other words, the evolution of the two dark sectors is described by the two critical indexes δ_G and δ_Λ. The dark energy and matter interact and can be converted from one to another. They obey the generalized Bianchi identity (total energy conservation),

$$a\frac{d}{da}\left[(G/G_0)(\Omega_\Lambda + \Omega_M)\right] = -3(G/G_0)(1+\omega_M)\Omega_M. \tag{4}$$

where effective variations of the gravitational coupling constant and of the cosmological constant generalize the standard Bianchi identity. For small redshift, assuming $\delta_\Lambda < \delta_G \ll 1$, Equation (4) leads to the relation

$$\delta_\Lambda = \left(\frac{\Omega_M^0}{\Omega_\Lambda^0}\right)\delta_G > 0. \tag{5}$$

In this article, such a quantum field cosmology (QFC) model with theoretical parameters $\Omega_{\rm M}^0$, Ω_Λ^0, δ_G and δ_Λ is compared with the observational cosmology, the case of $\delta_G = \delta_\Lambda = 0$ reducing to the the ΛCDM model.

[1] It was suggested by Weinberg (Steven 1977) that the quantum field theory of gravity regularized with an ultraviolet (UV) cutoff might have a non-trivial UV-stable fixed point and asymptotic safety, namely the renormalization group (RG) flows are attracted into the UV-stable fixed point with a finite number of physically renormalizable operators for the gravitational field.

[2] Instead, the inflationary cosmology could be realized in the scaling-invariant domain of an ultraviolet-unstable fixed point $\tilde{G}_0 \neq G_0$.

3 EFFECTIVE EOS AND INTERACTION OF DARK ENERGY AND MATTER

In the ΛCDM model, the Friedmann equations read:

$$H^2 = \frac{8\pi G}{3}(\rho_M + \rho_\Lambda), \tag{6}$$

$$\frac{\ddot{a}}{a} = -\frac{4\pi G}{3}(\rho_M + \rho_\Lambda + 3p_M + 3p_\Lambda) \tag{7}$$

Equations (2) and (3) in the QFC model can be obtained by phenomenologically introducing a slight deformation of the evolution of the dark sector of our Universe, obtained from the Friedmann equations:

$$\rho_M = \rho_M^0 a^{-3+\delta_G}, \tag{8}$$

$$\rho_\Lambda = \rho_\Lambda^0 a^{-\delta_\Lambda}. \tag{9}$$

Using definitions (8) and (9) in equations (6) and (7), one recovers equations (2) and (3) of the QFC model, given the EoS $p_\Lambda = -\rho_\Lambda$ and $p_M = 0$. Therefore, the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ of equations (8) and (9) correspond to the parameters of the QFC model discussed in section 2. The total conservation of dark energy and matter leads to the constraint (5) on δ_G and δ_Λ.

Although the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ are motivated by the QFC model, these parameters can also be explored on phenomenological grounds. It leads to another interpretation of parameters δ_G and δ_Λ.

Using the individual conservation of the energy momentum tensors for the dark matter and dark energy sectors respectively

$$\dot{\rho}_{M,\Lambda} + 3H(1+\omega_{M,\Lambda})\rho_{M,\Lambda} = 0, \tag{10}$$

and the Friedmann equation (6), we find that the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ in Eq. (2) can be interpreted as effective modifications of the EoS with

$$\omega_M = -\frac{\delta_G}{3} \tag{11}$$

$$\omega_\Lambda = -1 + \frac{\delta_\Lambda}{3}. \tag{12}$$

Besides, assuming the standard EoS ($\omega_M = 0, \omega_\Lambda = -1$), it is also possible to relate the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ to an interaction between dark matter and dark energy by introducing an interaction term Q

$$\dot{\rho}_M + 3H\rho_M = +Q, \tag{13}$$

$$\dot{\rho}_\Lambda = -Q. \tag{14}$$

In this case, the interaction term Q can be effectively expressed:

$$Q = H\delta_G\rho_M = H\delta_\Lambda\rho_\Lambda, \tag{15}$$

which leads also to the relation (5). Such interaction terms have been shown to alleviate the coincidence problem (Ferreira et al. 2014). We stress that this last interpretation in term of Q of the deformation the dark sector (8) (9) is valid only for small redshifts ($z \ll 1$), as otherwise the different evolutions in redshift for ρ_M and ρ_Λ invalidate (15). To obtain the general interaction term, one needs to consider the general evolution of the effective gravitational constant in equation (36) of Xue (2015a) but this investigation is out of the scope of this paper.

In this article, we will treat the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ in Eq. (2) as free parameters determined by the observational cosmology. Observe that in order to have a coherent model of dark energy, the constraint $\delta_G\delta_\Lambda > 0$ must be fulfilled. In this case, the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ can be interpreted as the rate of conversion of dark matter into dark energy and of dark energy into dark matter. A phenomenological investigation shows that increasing δ_G or decreasing δ_Λ induces an acceleration of the expansion of the universe: dark matter is converted into dark energy. Conversely, decreasing δ_G or increasing δ_Λ induces a deceleration of the expansion of the universe: dark energy is converted into dark matter.

The luminosity distance can be obtained

$$d_L(z) = \frac{c}{H_0}(1+z)\int_1^{\frac{1}{1+z}} \frac{da}{a^2\sqrt{\Omega_\Lambda^0 a^{-\delta_\Lambda} + \Omega_M^0 a^{\delta_G - 3}}}, \tag{16}$$

where the speed of light c is included for clarity. An analytic representation of the integral reads

$$\begin{aligned} d_L(z) =& \frac{2c}{H_0}\frac{1+z}{\Omega_M^0(1-\delta_G)} \times \Bigg[{}_2F_1\left(1, \frac{4-\delta_\Lambda-2\delta_G}{2(3-\delta_\Lambda-\delta_G)}, \frac{7-\delta_\Lambda-3\delta_G}{2(3-2\delta_\Lambda-\delta_G)}; -\frac{\Omega_\Lambda^0}{\Omega_M^0}\right) \\ & - \frac{\sqrt{(1+z)^{3-\delta_G}\Omega_M^0 + (1+z)^{\delta_\Lambda}\Omega_\Lambda^0}}{(1+z)^{2-\delta_G}}\ {}_2F_1\left(1, \frac{4-\delta_\Lambda-2\delta_G}{2(3-\delta_\Lambda-\delta_G)}, \frac{7-2\delta_\Lambda-3\delta_G}{2(3-\delta_\Lambda-\delta_G)}; -\frac{\Omega_\Lambda^0}{\Omega_M^0}(1+z)^{-3+\delta_G+\delta_\Lambda}\right)\Bigg], \end{aligned}$$

where ${}_2F_1$ is the hypergeometric function defined as: ${}_2F_1(a,b,c;z) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a)_n (b)_n}{(c)_n}\frac{z^n}{n!}$, with the Pochhammer symbol $(x)_n$ given by: $(x)_n \equiv \frac{\Gamma(x+n)}{\Gamma(x)}$. This equation is derived under the assumption of a flat universe, that is to say $\Omega_M^0 + \Omega_\Lambda^0 = 1$.

	Ω_M^0	h	δ_G	χ^2
flat FLRW	0.30 ± 0.03	0.704 ± 0.006	0	538.754
QFC model	0.27 ± 0.11	0.705 ± 0.008	-0.19 ± 0.9	538.596

Table 1. The best fit parameters for the two models under consideration and the associated χ^2, together with the 95 % confidence intervals. The parameter h is related to the Hubble constant via $H_0 \equiv 100h\frac{\text{km}}{\text{Mpc.s}}$. Note that the relation (5) is enforced.



Figure 1. Best fitting line for the FLRW model (red, upper curve) and the QFC model (green, lower curve), the quantitative results are given in table 1 (upper panel). Residuals errors of the χ^2 fit of the QFC model (lower panel).

4 FIT TO SUPERNOVAE DATA

In this section, the relation given by Equation (5) is enforced. It gives a constraint between the two new parameters of the QFC model. In section 5, this constraint is relaxed in order to study a broader range of the parameter space. We are now in position to perform a χ^2 fit with the Union 2.1 compilation released by the Supernova Cosmology Project (Suzuki et al. 2012). It is composed of 580 uniformly analyzed SNe Ia. We minimize the χ^2 defined as:

$$\chi^2(\text{parameters}) \equiv \sum_{i=1}^{580} \left[\frac{d_L(i) - d_L(\text{parameter})}{\Delta d_L(i)} \right]^2 \tag{17}$$

where $\Delta d_L(i)$ is the observational error bar for each data point indexed by i. A comparison of the result for QFC model and the standard flat FLRW model ($\delta_G = \delta_\Lambda = 0$) is presented in the table 1 together with the 95% confidence interval. Figure 1 displays the resulting Hubble diagram for both models and the residual of the fit for the QFC model.

From table 1, we note that the parameters of the Friedmann model are recovered with reasonable precision. However, there is a strong degeneracy between δ_G and Ω_M^0 for the QFC model (the fit gives a correlation coefficient equal to 95%). To investigate this issue, in the next section we inspect in more details the parameter space of the QFC model without imposing any constraints.

Only with SNe Ia the value Ω_M is poorly constrained (see table 1) but with joined data sets, the current best value is $\Omega_M = 0.308 \pm 0.012$ (Ade et al. 2016). An important point is that for most of interacting dark energy models both the dark matter and the baryonic matter fluids are assumed to interact with the dark energy, but as the nature of the baryonic matter is known from ground experiment, the type of interaction allowed between this matter and the hypothetical dark energy is strongly constrained. Therefore a more conservative approach would be to allow only dark matter (accounting for $\Omega_{DM} = 0.268 \pm 0.013$ (Ade et al. 2016)) to interact with dark energy and account for this interaction with a new term in the bias quantity describing the different behavior of the baryonic matter and the dark matter in the cosmic history. The fact



Figure 2. Contour which obtains a better χ^2 than the Friedmann model as a function of the two new parameters introduced for different value of Ω_M^0. For left to right, we displayed $\Omega_M^0 = 0.27, 0.30, 0.33$, observe the different scale for the difference of χ^2. The red regions are non-physical with $\delta_G\delta_\Lambda < 0$. Equation (5) has been also represented in blue, depending on the value of Ω_M^0, it is possible or not to find values for δ_G and δ_Λ linked by the relation (5) giving a better χ^2 than the one of the FLRW model.

that the best fit from the QFC model is $\Omega_M = 0.27$ might be a hint pointing to this requirement of having non-interacting baryonic matter (Amendola and Tocchini-Valentini 2002).

5 PARAMETER SPACE STUDY

In this section, we drop the relation (5) and explore the parameter space δ_G-δ_Λ for set values of the parameters H_0, Ω_Λ^0 and Ω_M^0 compatible with constraints from cosmological observations. H_0 is fixed to its standard value in the FLRW model from SNe Ia: $H_0 = 70.4\frac{\text{km}}{\text{Mpc.s}}$. The purpose of this section is to identify regions for which the χ^2 of the QFC model is smaller than that of the ΛCDM model.

On figure 2, we plotted the difference of χ^2 between the QFC and Friedmann models for different values of Ω_M. It is found that a large zone of the parameter space allows for the QFC model to have a smaller χ^2 than the one of the Friedmann model, constraining thus the QFC model. Figure 2 also shows the different quadrants allowing a physical QFC models satisfying the constraint $\delta_G\delta_\Lambda > 0$. The linear relation (5) is also displayed in blue. We see that, depending on the value for Ω_M, it is not certain to have values for δ_G and δ_Λ allowing for a better χ^2 than the FLRW together with the relation (5).

We end our analysis by performing a simple model comparison. We note that the FLRW and the QFC models are nested (the FLRW model is recovered with $\delta_G = \delta_\Lambda = 0$). Performing a F-test, we find that the addition of the parameters δ_G and δ_Λ, with and without imposing the relation (5), is not statistically required, as they do not significantly improve the fit. Indeed, with δ_G free and relation (5) imposed, it comes $F = 0.16$, while for both δ_G and δ_Λ free, $F = 0.34$. This is to be compared to the critical values, which respectively are $F_{\text{crit}} = 0.02$ and $F_{\text{crit}} = 0.11$ at the 90% confidence level.

6 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We presented a new model for interacting dark energy arising from the effective field theory of Einstein-Cartan gravity in section 2 and explored its observational consequences on supernovae Ia. We compared and contrasted it with the standard ΛCDM model assuming equation (5). We then explored the parameter space for this model to know for which value of the parameters, the model has a better χ^2 than its FLRW counterpart. We found that if one decreases slightly the matter content of the universe, a substantial zone of the parameter space offers a smaller χ^2 than the FLRW model. It could be a possible hint pointing to the need to consider a correction due to interacting dark energy to the halo bias for structure formation, we hope to come back to those questions. It is not the first time that decent alternatives to the ΛCDM model based on a time variation of the cosmological constant and interaction between dark matter and dark energy are explored. The QFC model provides one more example of such an alternative.

The QFC model of Xue (2015a) is also constrained by other independent experiments which constrains the effective variation of the gravitational constant. By Lunar Laser Ranging experiment (Williams et al. 2004), we find a bound for δ_G:

$$|\delta_G| < 0.02. \tag{18}$$

Furthermore the big-bang nucleosynthesis gives an even stringent constraint on the variation of the gravitational constant which translates for our parameters into:

$$|\delta_G| < \mathcal{O}(10^{-3}), \tag{19}$$

depending on the model used for nucleosynthesis (Iocco et al. 2009).

This study is a first step towards better exploring the parameter space and setting constraints on the parameters. As

already done for other interacting dark energy models, it needs to be challenged with different independent data set such as Baryon Acoustic Oscillation. An important extension of this work would be to follow the research plan carried for instance in Sola et al. (2016a) where similar models were confronted to 5 different data sets. We stress that to do so for this model, one needs not only to consider the dynamics explored in equations (2) and (3) which is only valid for small redshift but a more general one given by equation (36) of Xue (2015a).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DB is supported by a grant from Stiftelsen Olle Engkvist Byggmästare. CS is supported by the Erasmus Mundus Joint Doctorate Program by Grant Number 2013-1471 from the EACEA of the European Commission.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

SSX and CS concieved the study based on the model introduced by SSX. CS calculated the luminosity distance and started the data analysis. The more systematic data analysis in section 5 was carried out by DB. CS drafted the manuscript. All authors discussed the results, commented on the article and approved the final manuscript.

REFERENCES

P. A. R. Ade et al. Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 594:A13, 2016. doi: 10.1051/0004-6361/201525830.

Luca Amendola. Coupled quintessence. *Phys. Rev.*, D62:043511, 2000. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.62.043511.

Luca Amendola. Linear and non-linear perturbations in dark energy models. *Phys. Rev.*, D69:103524, 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.69.103524.

Luca Amendola and Domenico Tocchini-Valentini. Baryon bias and structure formation in an accelerating universe. *Phys. Rev.*, D66:043528, 2002. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.66.043528.

Krzysztof Bolejko, Marie-Noelle Celerier, and Andrzej Krasinski. Inhomogeneous cosmological models: Exact solutions and their applications. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 28:164002, 2011. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/28/16/164002.

Thomas Buchert. Dark Energy from Structure: A Status Report. *Gen. Rel. Grav.*, 40:467–527, 2008. doi: 10.1007/s10714-007-0554-8.

Valerio Faraoni, James B. Dent, and Emmanuel N. Saridakis. Covariantizing the interaction between dark energy and dark matter. *Phys. Rev.*, D90(6):063510, 2014. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.90.063510.

Elisa G. M. Ferreira, Jerome Quintin, Andre A. Costa, E. Abdalla, and Bin Wang. New evidence for interacting dark energy from BOSS. 2014.

Joshua A. Frieman and Ben-Ami Gradwohl. Dark matter and the equivalence principle. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 67:2926–2929, 1991. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.67.2926.

M. B. Gavela, D. Hernandez, L. Lopez Honorez, O. Mena, and S. Rigolin. Dark coupling. *JCAP*, 0907:034, 2009. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2010/05/E01,10.1088/1475-7516/2009/07/034. [Erratum: JCAP1005,E01(2010)].

Ben-Ami Gradwohl and Joshua A. Frieman. Dark matter, long range forces, and large scale structure. *Astrophys. J.*, 398:407–424, 1992. doi: 10.1086/171865.

Jian-Hua He and Bin Wang. Effects of the interaction between dark energy and dark matter on cosmological parameters. *JCAP*, 0806:010, 2008. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2008/06/010.

Fabio Iocco, Gianpiero Mangano, Gennaro Miele, Ofelia Pisanti, and Pasquale D. Serpico. Primordial Nucleosynthesis: from precision cosmology to fundamental physics. *Phys. Rept.*, 472:1–76, 2009. doi: 10.1016/j.physrep.2009.02.002.

Austin Joyce, Bhuvnesh Jain, Justin Khoury, and Mark Trodden. Beyond the Cosmological Standard Model. *Phys. Rept.*, 568:1–98, 2015. doi: 10.1016/j.physrep.2014.12.002.

Tomi S. Koivisto, Emmanuel N. Saridakis, and Nicola Tamanini. Scalar-Fluid theories: cosmological perturbations and large-scale structure. *JCAP*, 1509:047, 2015. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2015/09/047.

Kazuya Koyama, Roy Maartens, and Yong-Seon Song. Velocities as a probe of dark sector interactions. *JCAP*, 0910:017, 2009. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2009/10/017.

Seokcheon Lee, Guo-Chin Liu, and Kin-Wang Ng. Constraints on the coupled quintessence from cosmic microwave background anisotropy and matter power spectrum. *Phys. Rev.*, D73:083516, 2006. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.73.083516.

Riccardo Murgia, Stefano Gariazzo, and Nicolao Fornengo. Constraints on the Coupling between Dark Energy and Dark Matter from CMB data. *JCAP*, 1604(04):014, 2016. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2016/04/014.

S. Perlmutter et al. Measurements of Omega and Lambda from 42 high redshift supernovae. *Astrophys. J.*, 517:565–586, 1999. doi: 10.1086/307221.

Valeria Pettorino and Carlo Baccigalupi. Coupled and Extended Quintessence: theoretical differences and structure formation. *Phys. Rev.*, D77:103003, 2008. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.77.103003.

Adam G. Riess et al. Observational evidence from supernovae for an accelerating universe and a cosmological constant. *Astron. J.*, 116:1009–1038, 1998. doi: 10.1086/300499.

Valentina Salvatelli, Najla Said, Marco Bruni, Alessandro Melchiorri, and David Wands. Indications of a late-time interaction in the dark sector. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 113(18):181301, 2014. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.113.181301.

Joan Sola, Javier de Cruz Pérez, Adria Gomez-Valent, and Rafael C. Nunes. Dynamical Vacuum against a rigid Cosmological Constant. 2016a.

Joan Sola, Adria Gomez-Valent, and Javier de Cruz Pérez. First evidence of running cosmic vacuum: challenging the concordance model. 2016b.

Clément Stahl. Inhomogeneous matter distribution and supernovae. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.*, D25(06):1650066, 2016. doi: 10.1142/S0218271816500668.

Weinberg Steven. Understanding the Fundamental Constituents of Matter. *Plenum Press., New York*, 1977.

N. Suzuki et al. The Hubble Space Telescope Cluster Supernova Survey: V. Improving the Dark Energy Constraints Above z¿1 and Building an Early-Type-Hosted Supernova Sample. *Astrophys. J.*, 746:85, 2012. doi: 10.1088/0004-637X/746/1/85.

Shinji Tsujikawa. Quintessence: A Review. *Class. Quant. Grav.*, 30:214003, 2013. doi: 10.1088/0264-9381/30/21/214003.

Jussi Valiviita, Elisabetta Majerotto, and Roy Maartens. Instability in interacting dark energy and dark matter fluids. *JCAP*, 0807:020, 2008. doi: 10.1088/1475-7516/2008/07/020.

B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavon. Dark Matter and Dark Energy Interactions: Theoretical Challenges, Cosmological Implications and Observational Signatures. *Rept. Prog. Phys.*, 79(9):096901, 2016. doi: 10.1088/0034-4885/79/9/096901.

Christof Wetterich. The Cosmon model for an asymptotically vanishing time dependent cosmological 'constant'. *Astron. Astrophys.*, 301:321–328, 1995.

James G. Williams, Slava G. Turyshev, and Dale H. Boggs. Progress in lunar laser ranging tests of relativistic gravity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 93:261101, 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.93.261101.

She-Sheng Xue. How universe evolves with cosmological and gravitational constants. *Nucl. Phys.*, B897:326–345, 2015a. doi: 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2015.05.022.

She-Sheng Xue. The quantum gravitational field theory and the domains of its fix points for inflationary or low-redshift universe. *Int. J. Mod. Phys.,*, A30:1545003, 2015b. doi: 10.1142/S0217751X15450037.